

REMARKS

Thorough examination of the application is sincerely appreciated.

Applicant submits that for at least the following reasons claim 1 is patentable over the prior art of record.

For example, claim 1 requires

“beaconing according to a distributed Ultra WideBand Medium Access Control (UWB MAC) protocol by the host and the at least one connected device.”

Peters, paragraph [0054], apparently discloses that a wireless peripheral device waits to receive a polling message and responds to the polling message with a unique peripheral address or the received port number. However, Peters does not disclose that this waiting and responding of polling message is the beaconing according to a distributed UWB MAC protocol. Applicant submits that beaconing is not equivalent to Peter’s polling, as well know to those skilled in the art. Applicant submits that nothing in Peters teaches or suggests the use of any distributed UWB MAC protocol. Furthermore, Peters, paragraph [0036], apparently discloses that key management and encryption unit perform encryption and decryption of messages, but does not mention any distributed UWB MAC protocol. Therefore, Peters fails to disclose the claimed feature: beaconing according to a distributed Ultra WideBand Medium Access Control (UWB MAC) protocol by the host and the at least one connected device.

Applicant submits that neither Salokannel (US 2003/0086388) nor IEEE (IEEE Std. 802.15.3-2003) cures in any way the defects pointed out above with respect to Peters. Thus, claim 1 is patentable over Peters and IEEE, either singly or in combination.

Applicant's independent claims 20, 28, 36 and 41 include similar features as discussed hereinabove. For at least the same reasons, it is respectfully submitted that claims 20, 28, 36 and 41 are likewise patentable over the prior art of record.

Each dependent claim includes at least the above mentioned features of claim 1, 20, 28, 36 and 41, as well as additional distinguishing features. Therefore, dependent claims are also patentable.

An earnest effort has been made to be fully responsive to the examiner's correspondence and advance the prosecution of this case. In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is believed that the present application is in condition for allowance, and an early notice thereof is earnestly solicited.

In the event there are any errors with respect to the fees for this response or any other papers related to this response, the Director is hereby given permission to charge any shortages and credit any overcharges of any fees required for this submission to Deposit Account No. 14-1270.

Respectfully submitted,

By /LARRY LIBERCHUK/
Larry Liberchuk, Reg. No. 40,352
Senior IP Counsel
Philips Electronics N.A. Corporation